The Catholic University of America and Georgetown University.

THE archbishops. at their forthcoming annual conference, if we may believe the Washington correspondent of the *Freeman's Journal* (No. 3617), will devote their discussions largely to devising ways and means to increase the attendance at the Catholic University. While "the financial outlook for a gradual increase of endowment"—we are told—"is good," the "prospect that a greater number of students should frequent its halls is not so alluring."

"It has been shown," says the *Freeman's* correspondent, "that forty-seven hundred Roman Catholic young men are students in secular universities in this country. It would certainly seem possible that a considerable quota of this army of brilliant young men could be enlisted in the ranks of the Catholic University matriculates. Hundreds of other young Catholics go abroad to secure higher education, and frequently matriculate at Protestant universities. The archbishops will consider plans to gradually overcome the disposition*) of Catholic families to send their boys to Protestant institutions to obtain their final education. In this prejudice against Catholic institutions of learning there is much which is inexplicable, but there is one feature of the situation which may be immediately remedied. The number of divinity students is far below the number expected, both by the Pope and by the executive founders (?) of the Catholic University. The lowest estimate of divinity students was placed at two for each diocese and archdiocese in the country. This would give a nucleus student body of about two hundred, and joined to the scholastics and young priests of various orders and congregations affiliated with the University, would make a very creditable student roll. As a matter of fact, many of the dioceses of the country have never been recognized by the presence of a single student at the University. Some of the bishops obviously refrain from using its advantages. At the time of its foundation there was an implied promise on the part of all to send two students for the higher degrees, but its obligations have been flagrantly disregarded. That the trustees and archbishops should seek to rem-

*) The text has "*indisposition*," but this is clearly a typographical error.—A. P.

(The Review, Vol. IX, No. 43. St. Louis, Mo., November 6, 1902.)

edy this condition is natural, but the means to the end are not so obvious or so self-suggestive."

This practically amounts to the charge that a number of our bishops are not only neglecting to do their duty, but have broken a promise and offended the Pope. It is to be hoped that this wanton accusation of an irresponsible scribe is not abetted by the authorities of the University, who may well pray: "*A talibus defensoribus, libera nos, Domine!*"

When the same correspondent adds, in the next paragraph of his letter, that Georgetown University, conducted at the national capital by the Jesuits, finds its lecture halls "crowded to their utmost capacity," and that "the embarrassment here is rather for room than for students," this statement must, it is true, be considered in the light of the fact that "Georgetown has large undergraduate collegiate classes from which to fill it post-graduate courses," while the Catholic University "must look for its students to the graduates of other schools;" but the parallel between the two institutions furnishes material for reflection. The *Freeman's* correspondent is forced to admit:

"At the beginning of this scholastic year, as for two years before, Georgetown has been compelled to refuse to receive all the students presented to it. Many of these were not turned away because of insufficient preparation in the lower grades. Several were refused, because there was absolutely no room for them in the dormitories or halls. The Georgetown post-graduate classes in philosophy, law, and medicine, are proverbially large, and its purely post-graduate work (is) on a plane and of character to attract notice throughout the country. These statements are not made in a comparative sense, but for the purpose of marking the fact that where the highest institution receives loyal support from its alumni and well wishers the student body is large. The reason that so few graduate students resort to the splendid courses of the Catholic University is want of enthusiasm on the part of the laity and clergy throughout the country."

A further spinning-out of the suggested parallel, especially with reference to the probable causes of the popularity of the one and the "want of enthusiasm" shown towards the other, might prove useful and instructive. The files of THE REVIEW could furnish much valuable material therefor.

Shall the Government Operate the Coal Mines?

THE recent crisis in the coal trade, now temporarily averted by the settlement of the great strike, gave rise to a popular demand, which has even been incorporated in the State platform of the Democratic party in New York, that the government shall take possession of the anthracite coal mines under the law of eminent domain and operate them for the benefit of the public.

This has led eminent economists to examine the question: Would it be conducive to public interest that the government should undertake the business of coal mining? Here is what one of them thinks:

People who attempt to decide this question off-hand, assume that there is some mysterious power in a government, enabling it to take hold of a new and vast business of the most technical and complex nature, and make it a success, where private enterprise and skill of the highest type, backed by unlimited capital, have resulted in a deadlock. The least reflection should convince us that if the government owned the mines and machinery to-day it would inevitably break down in an attempt to supply 50,000,000 tons of anthracite coal in twelve months and deliver it to the buyers at the average price heretofore charged for it. The only way it could accomplish any effective work, would be to hire the present owners and employés, at suitable salaries, to carry it on. This would be the first thing to do. The next would be to raise the wages of the miners to the scale demanded by them in the present strike. The miners are not striking for sentimental or political reasons, or to bring about an ideal state of society, but to better their physical condition. Therefore, a rise of wages would necessarily precede any resumption of mining.

But this is not all that they would expect. Government seldom gets any work done as cheaply or as well as private persons do. The spur of self-interest that devises economies which make up the whole difference between success and failure, would be wanting. Miners would expect higher wages from the government than from private operators; and would have considerable influence as voters in deciding what the wages should be. Unless coal mining is to become in part a charge upon the taxpayers, the price of coal would have to be increased largely and permanently.

We have assumed that the government might secure the services of the men who are now the heads of the mining industry, but this is by no means certain. Very few men possessing the

requisite skill and experience could be obtained for the salaries which the government usually pays to its highest public servants, such as cabinet ministers, justices of the Supreme Court, etc. It is quite certain, however, that the politicians would very soon be scheming for these places, both high and low. If "the government," which is to own the coal mines, means the government of Pennsylvania, Senator Quay would soon be the boss of all the mines and carrying companies, and every man who entered the service, either as a certificated miner or as a mule-driver, would eventually be an office-holder whose place would be at the disposal of the party machine. All these things would happen unless the government of Pennsylvania should have means for operating coal mines and railroads superior to those which it has for administering municipal affairs in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. But it would probably have less, since there would be fewer persons to keep an eye on the office-holders in the mines than on those in the City Hall.

Those who favor the policy of the national government instead of State governments taking charge of the coal mines, because it is a national question, would not restrict the transfer of ownership to anthracite mines, but would have it embrace bituminous mines and lignite beds, and probably oil wells and natural gas. Most of them seem to favor the working of gold and silver mines by the government also. Iron, lead, copper, zinc, and borax mines would naturally come next. All the political meddling that we might expect from separate State action would be repeated on a larger scale. Quay would not lose his influence over Pennsylvania mines by their transfer to the national government. The people would demand all the products of government mines at as low a price as the same were previously supplied for, and if there were a failure of the supply, or a material advance in price, would "arraign" the party in power, and in any extreme case, like the present deficiency of coal, would hurl it from power.

The public interest lies in having coal supplied in sufficient quantity at the lowest possible price. There is no reason to believe that the government could do this work nearly as well as it has been done in the past by private enterprise. No doubt there have been grave abuses in the private mining and transportation of anthracite coal which a wise government might properly take cognizance of and chastise, without assuming ownership of the mines, but those abuses have been fewer and less heinous than would have been committed under government mining, while the supply of coal has been more regular and the price lower to the consumer than it would have been under such a system.

The false economic principles upon which our modern com-

mercial development rests, will inexorably have their way. Not even the government can prevent them. This is a hard saying, perhaps, but we can see no easier one. Government ownership would be stepping from the frying-pan into the fire.

Can the Pope Designate His Own Successor?

By W. F. G.

III.

Those who deny this right of designation have employed chiefly the following arguments to maintain their position:

1st. Designation is forbidden not only by ecclesiastical law, but also by the natural and divine law. They appeal to the declaration of Anaclete (C. 11, D. 79) that God has reserved to Himself the election of his high-priests, and the cardinals are his instruments in this election.

2. Designation would be an "*immutatio status ecclesiae*," which the sacred canons forbid.

3. It would introduce a species of inheritance of ecclesiastical office which all agree may not obtain in the New Dispensation.

4. It would open a wide way to the practice of nepotism.

5. A favorite argument was formulated by Cajetan, thus: "Ejus est potentia cujus est actus; atqui actus electionis papae, absolute et simpliciter non est papae, quia iam non est; electus autem debet esse cotemporaneus cum electore; ergo."

6. They urge the analogy which exists between the pope and the Church and husband and wife. But, they say, no man can designate with binding force his wife's next husband.

7. Designation would make the Church "biceps," two-headed, one pope having a *jus ad rem*, another a *jus in re*.

To these arguments the advocates of the affirmative opinion reply in general that they would be most formidable objections indeed to designation as a regular mode of providing for the succession in the Holy See; but that they lose all their force when urged against designation as an extraordinary mode. Taken singly, the objections are answered as follows:

Ad I. Designation can not be shown to be contrary to the nat-

ural and divine law. There is no positive legislation of Christ on the mode of filling the office of Head of the Church, and the only way in which designation can possibly be fancied to be contrary to the natural law, is to suppose that it would always be harmful to the Church. But the very contrary would frequently be true. We may well imagine an internecine war which might delay the election of a pope for years. Besides, divine law, so far as we may be said to have any law on the matter, seems rather to favor designation. Christ Himself designated Peter to be His own vice-gerent, and Christ is an example for our instruction. Peter designated Clement to be his successor, and if it be urged that he was inspired to do this, then this fact of inspiration must be proven, or if he did so because of the necessity of the circumstances, then this act serves precisely as a precedent for future designations.

Ad II. Designation would be an "*immutatio status ecclesiae*" indeed, if it were adopted as the regular mode of filling the See of Peter, and it would be the "*immutatio status ecclesiae*" which is reprobated by the canons. But is not the pope above the canons? And may he not suspend them, for a just and sufficient cause, in a particular case?

Ad III. It is true that the inheritance of spiritual offices may not obtain in the Church. But to obtain an office by designation, in a particular case, would not be that inheritance which is condemned by the sacred canons.

Ad IV. This is really the most serious objection of all. But it is safe to say that designation, under the limitations which the advocates of the affirmative opinion propose, would occasion incomparably less of nepotism and kindred abuses than the succession by way of election has permitted. Besides, if it be insisted that the popes might use their right of designation too freely, we may point to the comparatively small number of popes who were not conscientious men, and none, or hardly one, who was not so on his deathbed. Besides if this objection were to be admitted, we should have to deny all rights to the Supreme Pontiff, since all are liable to abuse.

Ad V. Cajetan confounds designation with election in his "most acute reasoning." Election presupposes indeed the "*viduitas ecclesiae*," but designation does not; rather, it supposes the very opposite. If designation and election were the very same as Cajetan assumes, then we would indeed have a dead pope placing an act; but designation supposes a live pope.

Ad VI. Like all analogies, this one should not be carried too far. Of course we must deny that all the relations which exist between husband and wife obtain also between the pope and the

Church. The Fathers themselves who first used this analogy, confined it within very narrow limits.

Ad VII. To this objection, that "designation would make the Church biceps," Hollweck (Archiv für Kathol. Kirchenrecht, 1895) has given the best answer: "Risum teneatis amici?" he asks. Designation gives only a *jus ad rem.* As well talk of this country having two presidents during the interval of time between the election and the inauguration of a new president.

IV.

Besides thus answering objections, the advocates of the affirmative opinion add the following positive reasons:

1. Christ designated Peter, and the conduct of Christ is always an example for our instruction.

2. Peter designated his successor Clement. ("Si Petrus," 1, c. 8, q. 7.) But Peter could not have done this, if it were forbidden *jure naturali et divino.* The contention that Clement was merely nominated or proposed by Peter, but really elected by the Senate of the Roman Church, is a purely gratuitous assertion.

3. Boniface II., Gregory VII., Victor III., and Urban II., designated their successors.

4. Pope Symmachus ordained (C. 10, D. 79) that the pope should, before his death, assemble the Roman clergy and agree (*decernere*) as to his successor.

5. According to C. 17, C7, the pope can grant to others the power of designating their own successors; *a pari*, at least, should he be able to designate his own.

6. All grant that he can, *ex potestate ordinaria*, legislate in general about his succession. Why not in particular?

7. It is forbidden only *jure ecclesiastico.* Hence in a particular case, and for a sufficient cause, the pope can dispense from this prohibition.

V.

So far the arguments which canonists have commonly adduced in favor of the affirmative opinion. They are of course, far from being conclusive. Exceptions, and well-founded ones, too, may be taken to every one of them. (Except possibly, as we shall see later, to the historical argument that Boniface II. designated his own successor.)

To the first argument for the affirmative opinion it is objected that Christ's example in designating Peter may not be followed by us. Christ was the Supreme Lord over His Church and might dispose of it as He pleased. But the popes are only administrators, and may dispose of their succession only as the constitution

of the Church directs. Besides, according to St. Augustine, Christ is an example for us to follow in those things only which He did as Man, not as God. But it was as God that He appointed His Vice-gerent upon earth.

Ad 2. Cap. I., "Si Petrus," is not authentic. It is taken from a letter which was supposed to have been written by Clement himself, but which, in reality, is of a very much later date. The assertion contained in this Chapter I, therefore, and attributed to Clement, "that he had been designated by Peter himself to be his successor," is not authentic and must be rejected.

Ad 3. The historical precedents here adduced can not be shown to have been designations in the proper and strict sense of the term, but rather commendations. The person thus designated was always either rejected by the cardinals or was required to submit to an election (Ferraris, s. v. Papa, N. 10).

Ad 4. The word *decernere* here is ambiguous, and might well mean, especially in the light of its context, "to deliberate."

Ad 5 and 6. The parity of cases is denied. The alleged parity might be appealed to if no other provision already existed for filling the See of Rome.

Ad 7. Those who hold the negative opinion, deny, of course, that designation is forbidden *jure ecclesiastico* only.

They appeal to C. 11, D. 79, where Anaclete teaches explicitly that God has reserved to Himself the election of his high-priests, using the cardinals as his instruments of election.

[*To be concluded.*]

CONTEMPORARY CHRONICLE.

THE RELIGIOUS WORLD.

Political Dissensions Among the Catholics of Spain.—Like France and Italy, Spain is convulsed by the machinations of secret societies that manage to rule through the unfortunate dissensions between Carlists and Alphonsists. Leo XIII. has repeatedly sought to remedy the evil; six Catholic congresses have been held for that purpose, yet the evil still exists, as may be seen from the following.

La Cruz (Carlist) faithfully chronicles the events of the last Catholic Congress at Compostella (July 19-23). The Congress was opened and presided over by Cardinal Herrera, assisted by thirteen other archbishops and bishops. It adopted beautiful resolutions concerning papal independence, the school question, the religious orders, and the social question. But the leading and ever recurring note in all speeches and resolutions is the necessity of Catholic unity. With that note ended also the reviewing speech of Cardinal Herrera in the closing session: "Obedience to Pope and bishops, who alone are charged with the direction of consciences. The bishops well distinguish between constituted power and legitimacy and adhere to the instructions given by the Pope to the pilgrims of 1894."

Had *La Cruz* said no more, its report would have made a favorable impression, but it might have harmed the Carlist cause; so it tells its readers that the number of adherents who sent in their names amounted to 3500—a little more than half of the number inscribed at the former Congress at Lugo; the actual number of visitors present it gives as 1500, with the clergymen in a great majority.

Not satisfied with this, the Carlist monthly follows up its report on the Catholic Congress with an impassionate speech given on July 29th in a theatre at Compostella by a prominent Carlist, who had been at Compostella during the time of the Catholic Congress and whom certain newspapers had credited with the purpose of joining the ranks of the Alphonsists. That apparently was the cause of his appearance on the stage; in reality he aimed at restoring the sunken spirits of the Carlists. He ridiculed Catholic union as proposed by the Catholic Congress and nearly the whole Spanish episcopate, stating his belief in the necessity of religious union and Catholic union in social life, but claiming political autonomy for himself and his friends.

According to *El Correo Español*, immense applause followed the oratorical effort of the speaker. But a few days later came a douche, when the fourteen Spanish prelates present at the Compostella Congress issued a manifesto to the nation, in which they seriously invited all to join the Catholic union for common action, recognizing, in carefully worded terms, but nevertheless very plainly, the existing government. Thirty-six more archbishops and bishops promptly signed this manifesto. That augurs well for Catholic union. Only the Cardinal Primate and two other bishops do not appear in *La Cruz* as having given their approval.

The Carlists may find some consolation in this, but it is like that of a man who receives doughnuts instead of expected dollars.

The Lack of Catholic Public Life in the U. S.—The Rev. Peter C. Yorke, of San Francisco, in an article in the *Leader*, makes a note in the *Messenger* the occasion of a stiff lecture on the dearth of Catholic public life in America.

"Some fifteen years ago," he says, "we had a Catholic congress in Baltimore, and we never had one since."

While this is not correct, inasmuch as the Baltimore Congress was followed by a second similar conference at Chicago in 1893; it is nevertheless true that two Catholic congresses in a hundred years is a poor record compared with that of the Catholics of Germany, who since the Culturkampf meet annually in numerous and magnificent gatherings. Nor is it less interesting to learn Father Yorke's opinion of the reasons for our own apathy.

As first reason he gives "the objection of the ultra-liberal crowd, lest they might offend their non-Catholic friends." And in this connection he holds the late John Boyle O'Reilly chiefly responsible, who "did more than Cromwell to un-Irish the Irish."

But O'Reilly is not the only target for Father Yorke's displeasure:

"The way Archbishop Ireland walked into the Congress fifteen years ago with his coat open and his hands in his pockets and captured all the lay delegates, was another blow to the idea. The conservative prelates got afraid that the Catholic Church was going to be turned into a red democracy with the Metropolitan of St. Paul for perpetual Presiding Bishop. They did not realize that it was the very newness of the meeting that made Archbishop Ireland's maneuvre possible. A community accustomed to congresses would not be tricked so simply. The cure for demagogism is not to abolish public meetings but to accustom the people to their use."

The *Pilot* of Oct. 25th, to whom we are indebted for these quotations (the *Leader* not being among our exchanges), thinks Msgr. Ireland could not have killed the Catholic Congress idea, as there was a second congress in 1893, at which the Archbishop of St. Paul was a prominent speaker and his particular friend Onahan was chairman. As for Boyle O'Reilly, our Boston contemporary, whose editor he was in life, defends him against Father Yorke's charge by testifying to his staunch and practical Catholicity which brooked no libertinage with religious doctrines and principles.

The *Pilot* admits, however, that "the Catholic congress is not yet acclimated in America," because we have not yet much of Catholic public life, and seems inclined to concede the correctness of this paragraph from Father Yorke's article:

"Why we have no public life is due to many causes. It is due to the fear of antagonizing non-Catholics. It is due to the fear of professing oneself openly and fearlessly a Catholic. It is due above all to a certain supineness among Catholics, clerical and lay, and a tendency to fear or ridicule the free discussion of discussible questions in open meeting."

LITERATURE.

The Convents of Great Britain. By Francesca M. Steele (Darley Dare.) With a Preface by Father Thurston, S. J. St. Louis B. Herder. 1902. (Price, net $2.)

The title of this book is misleading. Miss Steele enumerates only the congregations of women settled in Great Britain, not those of men. The number of separate female communities in England and Scotland, nearly all possessing a chapel of their own, where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved and mass is at least occasionally celebrated, she gives as over six hundred, with an average of from ten to twelve Sisters to each establishment. We are thus led to the conclusion that the number of Catholic nuns at present domiciled in England and Scotland must exceed six or seven thousand and may possibly amount to more. Many of these congregations are also represented in the United States, which makes the work useful for reference.

THE CATHOLIC PRESS.

How to Get a Catholic Daily Press.—Much attention is given at the present time to the project of a Catholic daily. Several papers have ably advocated it, and others are "very tolerant" towards it. Says the *Catholic Citizen*: "Let it be talked about. Let it be attempted. Let it come. The discussion may stir up some Catholics who are now not taking even a Catholic weekly" (No. 51.)

The *Citizen* fears, however, that a Catholic daily will not prove a success. Adverting to the fact that there are several Catholic dailies in Holland, the editor remarks: "But in this country we have a different environment. The Catholic population is not massed but intermingled with other creeds."

An American clergyman born and raised in Holland comments on this objection as follows in a letter to THE REVIEW: "This is certainly a serious difficulty but not insuperable. Of the eleven Dutch provinces there are nine in which there is as much intermingling of Catholics and Protestants as here in the U. S. The only real obstacle to a Catholic American daily is perhaps the comparatively small number of generous, zealous, and intelligent Catholics. There are many more Catholics in New York and Chicago than in Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague, and Utrecht. Yet every one of these Holland cities, with a population of which a large majority is Protestant, has a Catholic daily.

"How did the Dutch succeed in getting up Catholic dailies and making them successful? Simply as any business man succeeds: by good, hard, and (last but not least) united work. The bishops and priests advocated the cause publicly and privately. So did many laymen, and all generously supported it. Some dailies have a priest as chief or associate editor, as *De Tijd* and *Het Centrum*, but most of them are edited by laymen. Committees have been established in several parishes in order to promote the Catholic press, and many parish-priests, admonished by episcopal letters, have done admirable work in spreading Catholic literature among their parishioners.

"A Latin proverb says: *Omne malum a clero.* We would rather say: *Omne bonum a clero.* Whichever may be nearer the truth, it is an undeniable fact, that in a country where the Catholic

press does not flourish, the clergy are chiefly to blame. They should advocate in season and out of season the necessity of the Catholic press. Every pastor, moreover, can easily find in his congregation a man or a woman who will act as agent for one or more Catholic papers. Many a poor man would be glad to earn a couple of dollars as a canvasser for Catholic books and journals. I know this from personal experience.

"The only thing we need in order to have a vital, representative Catholic daily is a little more generosity and much more work. *Labor omnia vincit improbus.*"

THE STAGE.

An Objectionable Play.—The Boston *Republic* (No. 42) issues a warning against the play produced this season by Miss Julia Marlowe and her company: "Queen Fiammetta," by Catulle Mendes. Having seen it in the Hollis Street Theatre, the *Republic's* editor writes as follows:

"Its author, Catulle Mendes, is a Parisian poet of Portuguese descent, whose literary flights have carried him in a direction quite opposite to the soarings of his fellow Lusitanian, Santos-Dumont. Mendes is more at home in the Inferno than in the empyrean. He is not only depraved himself, but he exalts and teaches depravity. He has beauty at his command, but it is the beauty of serpents and of panthers, of sinister, cruel passions that writhe and crouch in the dark recesses of our nature. The French courts have taken notice of his shamelessness. He counts his victims among the gifted women of Paris. To minds like his, religion is unintelligible. The only form of beauty which they comprehend is that of Circe and the Sirens. The Madonna's loveliness escapes them. The Church, aiming to subdue and regulate passion, presents itself to them as a savage tyrant, and their response to her lofty admonitions is that attitude of violent rebellion which is so familiar in the Latin countries. This is the spirit in which Catulle Mendes has drawn his picture of Bologna during the Italian Renaissance. The leading figures of his play are churchmen,—a cardinal, who is Cesare Borgia under a slight disguise of name,—a young friar, who consents to assassinate a queen,—a Grand Inquisitor, who decrees in the name of the Pope himself the tragic and cruel catastrophe. Over this wicked consummation the Cardinal in his red robes presides like a consecrated Mephisto. Worldly intrigue, fanaticism, intolerance,—these are the aspects of Catholicism which are exhibited to the spectator of this play. Borgia, Ravaignac, Torquemada, such are the figures selected as typical of the Church. Even the comedy scenes are irreverent. The spirit of this degenerate Latin plays about holy things with a curious fascination, as if blasphemy had its own intrinsic delight," etc.

The *Republic* suggests that the Catholic press of the country should, by raising a united voice of protest against such shameless exhibitions as this "Queen Fiametta," force their speedy retirement from the stage, which, in our large cities, where theatrical troups chiefly seek their patronage, depends in no small measure for its financial success upon the good will of our people.

THE REVIEW is willing to do its share in such a campaign for the elevation of the stage.

MISCELLANY.

Free Parochial Schools.—The forty-seventh general convention of the German Catholic Central Society has adopted, among many other timely and strong resolutions, one in favor of making our Catholic parochial schools, wherever possible, free schools in the full sense of the word. This is in harmony with a recommendation of the Fathers of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, which has been echoed and re-echoed in THE REVIEW at least a hundred times. If our parochial schools are not made free schools, they will ultimately go under,—mark the prophecy. But how can they be made free schools? The Fathers of the Council have indicated the way:

"Let the laity provide a sufficient and generous support of the schools. For this end they will have to unite their forces so as to be enabled to meet at all times the expenses of the parish and of the parochial school. Let the faithful be admonished either by pastoral letters or by sermons or private talks, that they gravely neglect their duty if they do not provide, according to their means and power, for the Catholic schools. Especially ought those to be made to realize this obligation who rank above the others in wealth and influence. Let parents, therefore, promptly and gladly pay the small monthly fee which it is customary to charge for each pupil, and let the other members of the parish not refuse to create and increase the fund which is required for the support of the school. All—be they parents or other heads of families, or young men with an income of their own—should be ready to enroll themselves as members of a society which we earnestly recommend to be established in every parish, already introduced in some and freely blessed by the Holy Father, calculated to make the schools free, at least in part, by the regular if modest contributions of its members."

The example of those parishes (their number is constantly increasing) which have successfully tried this plan, ought to induce others to follow. We also hope to see the number of those well-to-do Catholics increase who, in making their will, set aside a legacy for the support of their parish school.

The Nationality of Our Hierarchy.—The inaccuracy of the average Catholic American weekly is appalling. Here comes the *Intermountain Catholic*, which recently had itself complimented as one of the best Catholic newspapers of the country, and tells us editorially (No. 3), in its usual slovenly style:

"Many races are represented among the bishops of this country. There are, for instance, the Anglo-Americans like Bishops Williams, Northrup, and Curtis; the French, like Bishops Chapelle, Durier, Glorieux, and Rouxel; the Germans, like Archbishop Katzer and Bishops Alerding, Eis, Fink, Haid, Horstmann, Maes, Schwebach, Moeller, Richter; the Dutch, like Bishops Janssen and Van de Vyver; the Irish, like Archbishops Ireland, Keane, Riordan, Ryan, Bishops Scanlan, Hogan, Burke, Donahue, O'Reilly, and Phelan; and the peoples represented by Bishops Gabriels, Matz, Messmer, Meerschaert, and Arobec. Strange to say, says an exchange, there are no Spaniards, al-

though some of the sees were founded by Spanish missionaries, and there are many Spaniards in the United States. But Archbishops Chapelle and Bourgade and Bishop Granjon and other prelates speak Spanish."

Msgr. Williams is an Archbishop. Bishop Northrop writes his name with an "o." Msgr. Chapelle also belongs to the Archbishops. Bishop Glorieux is not a Frenchman but a Belgian. Archbishop Katzer is an Austrian by birth, but we will let that pass, as he is German by race. Bishop Schwebach, it may be remarked in passing, was born in Luxembourg. Msgr. Maes is not a German in any sense. His native land is Belgium. Neither Bishop Janssen nor Bishop Van de Vyver are Dutch: the former was born in Germany, the latter in Belgium. About the Irish prelates we have only to remark that the list given is very incomplete. Msgr. Gabriels ought to have been added to the Belgians, Msgr. Matz either to the French—if birth-place was to be considered—or to the Germans, if the list was to be drawn up according to race. Bishop Messmer is a Swiss by birth, German by nationality. Msgr. Meerschaert also belongs to the Dutch-Belgian element. There is no Bishop Arobec; we presume Msgr. Trobec (pronounced Trobetts) is meant. He is a native of Carniola, Austria. We know positively that there is at least one Spaniard among the members of our hierarchy, our excellent friend Bishop Verdaguer, Vicar-Apostolic of Brownsville, Texas. To the list of Spanish-speaking prelates should have been added Msgr. Matz of Denver.

We can not guarantee that even with these corrections the list is complete or strictly accurate; but we simply wished to show up its inaccuracies as they appeared to the casual reader and to point the moral that no one not thoroughly and correctly informed on the subject ought to undertake to get up such summaries.

The Case of Father Augustine.—The War Department, thanks to Messrs. Charles Francis Adams, Carl Schurz, and others, has investigated the case of the Filipino priest, Father Augustine, tortured and killed by Capt. Cornelius M. Brownell of the Twenty-sixth Volunteer Infantry, and has found sufficient evidence on hand to justify the Attorney-General in proceeding in the matter. We have lost count of the number of times the charges in this case have been declared to be nonsense in official and semi-official circles, but it is entirely due to the much-maligned Anti-Imperialist Committee that there is now a chance of justice being done at last. If Secretary Root's policy of suppression and connivance had continued, this case would have been entirely overlooked, and the facts denied. It is interesting to note that the special dispatch to the N. Y. *Tribune* (Oct. 25th) telling of the action in the Brownell case, concludes by saying that there are still nearly one hundred charges against the War Department and army "which the Anti-Imperialists make no pretence of establishing, and the War Department can only contemptuously ignore." It "contemptuously ignored" Father Augustine's murder for a year or two until Anti-Imperialists produced the facts. Then, after several months, it took action on September 18th, and it has taken the Judge-Advocate-General five weeks to decide whether the case should be referred to the Attorney-General or not. "The War

Department," says the doughty *Evening Post* of New York (Oct. 25th), "need not delude itself into believing that it will be allowed to 'contemptuously ignore' all the other cases, for the Lake George Committee, which is shaming the War Department by doing its work of prosecution, has plenty of additional evidence on hand to submit at the proper time."

NOTE-BOOK.

No less than 1,081 of our soldiers were during the past year punished for desertion, 846 for absence without leave, and 263 for sleeping on post. A new crime added to the category is "disrespect to the memory of President McKinley," for which four men are languishing in jail, much as men are punished in Europe for *lèse-majesté*. Finally, 2,645 were dishonorably discharged. During most of the period under consideration the army has had an enlisted strength of about 70,000, exclusive of Filipino troops. In this connection the statement of an officer now on duty in the Philippines, quoted in the New York *Evening Post* of Oct. 13th, is of interest. His regiment, a new one, proceeded to the Archipelago within eight months of its formation, composed mostly of beardless youths under twenty-one. The rainy season and the presence of cholera have made anything like strict discipline impossible. "The history of other regiments out here is simply degeneration, and I do not hope for any improvement in drill and discipline while in these islands."

With officers talking this way, what will those ardent patriots say who discredited *a priori* and denounced us utterly impossible the stories of our soldiers' misdeeds in the Philippines?

The Boston *Pilot* (Oct. 11th, 1902, p. 4) in speaking of the death of Father Kreiten, S. J., adds the following remark: "This is the second great Catholic lost to Germany within a few weeks, the other being the eminent scientist and fearless champion of the Church, Dr. Virchow."

Professor Virchow was born of Protestant parents, never became a Catholic, but lived and died an enemy of the Church and of all revealed religion. In short, he was an atheist.

We read in the *American Ecclesiastical Review* (Oct. 1902, p. 437): "The German Theological Reviews have for some time past been engaged in a sort of contest as to how far there exists a necessity of a reform in the methods of teaching moral theology in our seminaries. Americans have in this case demonstrated their practical superiority over the learned professors of the Fatherland by the publication of up to date editions and new text-books, such as those of Father Barrett [Sabetti!] and Tanquerey, whilst Father Putzer....has in hand a new edition of Koning" [Konings!].

Comment: 1. Within the last fifteen years probably a dozen text-

books on moral theology have been published by as many learned professors of the Fatherland. 2. Father Lehmkuhl, who took a hand in the "sort of contest," at the same time published a new edition of his great standard Moral Theology. Father Noldin's Moral Theology in two volumes, also just published, receives great praise in the *Theologische Revue* (Sept. 14th, 1902). 3. Father Sabetti was a Neapolitan and his work is printed and published in Germany; Father Tanquerey is a Frenchman, formerly in Baltimore, now living in Paris; the late Father Konings was a Hollander!!

Rev. M. Arnoldi, of Ft. Jennings, O., requests us to correct a slight mistake in our notice, in No. 39, of his pamphlet: 'The Pen and the Press.' The same will be sent to any address not for ten cents, but for ten two-cent stamps or two dimes. We notice, by the way, that the Rev. editor of the *Katholische Rundschau* and a number of other clergymen, especially of the Cleveland Diocese, have no confidence in Father Arnoldi as a promoter of the cause of a Catholic daily, in which he has lately embarked.

It is nowhere recorded in the Scriptures that a patriarch or prophet ever tried to attract or hold the attention of his people by whistling, and if whistling in the pulpit is not "a peculiarly modern accomplishment," will our esteemed contemporary, the *Catholic Universe* (which questions our authority in the premises in its No. 1476) kindly inform us how early it became a part of the liturgy?

Columbia University has decided to go Harvard one better and grant the degree of bachelor of arts after a two years' course. The plan is perfectly feasible, says an exchange, for after two years at college a young man is quite as well qualified for the degree as at the end of four years, with the possible exception of the departments of golf, tennis, and football. Indeed, it would save time and money if the preparatory schools were empowered to confer the degree of A. B., leaving the universities as a post-graduate course for specialists. With every high-school pupil an A. B. and every returning hero from foreign wars an LL. D., we should at once take a commanding place as the intellectual leader of nations.

The doughty *Casket* (No. 42) administers this severe but well-deserved rebuke to the organ of the Paulists:

"A writer in the *Catholic World* magazine speaks of 'our fellow-Christians of the Unitarian denomination.' A cardinal tenet of Unitarianism is the denial of the deity of Christ. Now we Christians believe that Christ is God, and they certainly are not our fellow-Christians who are not fellow-believers with us in this fundamental tenet of Christianity. We might as well call the Turks, who believe in one God, our fellow-Christians. It is but a spurious courtesy that keeps not within the bounds of truth."